

601 whytga
paham'ligason's wife, wife of all relatives except as noted elsewhere
husband of all relatives except as noted, wife's brother or her
grandparents¹

I am doubtful regarding the application of some terms. Sinyella did not know what a woman's female cross-cousin's children should be called, nor the terms for a man's older brother's or male parallel-cousin's children. He said the latter would just be recognized as relatives. Djerdwaimo gave *notig* for a woman's male parallel-cousin's child, *btiga* for the son, and *pefiga* for the daughter of her female parallel-cousin; but I think she is mistaken. Probably she did not understand the question. She did not know what her daughter Helen would call Pete's grandchildren if he had any, i.e., Helen's father's younger half-brother's grandchildren (see the genealogical chart).

There are no terms for a husband's brother or sister, nor their spouses, nor for a wife's sister or her husband, nor a wife's brother's wife, nor for a husband's parents, nor a child's parents-in-law. There are no terms for step-parents; they are not called by parent terms, because "we are afraid, for the father and mother are dead." Half-brothers and sisters are called brothers and sisters.

[55] References to dead relatives are by the relationships they bear to the living, as Manakadja's father. The form *panyd'atawidj*, my father now dead, was recorded.

The reciprocal of *kotiga* is said to be *nagotiga*, but other terms are given for the reciprocal relationships. The word *gaddjiga* may mean relative in general, as *inydnyan, ikaddjiddj*, Sun, my relative, occurring in a prayer.² In a myth, "Wolf, my father" was recorded as *hatdguwl n, andkóta*, said to be an obsolete term; son-in-law, *ginytga*, was also recorded as *ginytyd*.

601 These meanings were checked at the hand of genealogical data given
124 by Mark Hanna, his sister Susie, his nephew Jess Checkapanyega, and
[115] Jess's mother, Djerdwaimo. A record was made of the terms used by
Mark and Jess for every living relative, and the reciprocal terms, on the
basis of the agency census, before any genealogical charts were drawn, so
that the names did not occur in logical order. The accompanying chart
601 gives Jess's relatives in full. For convenience I have separated his

¹The following possessive forms were recorded in myths:—

<i>nyā, aqadādj</i>	my mother's father	<i>nyā, adjedj kj</i>	my father's younger brother
<i>n, amochd</i>	my mother's mother	<i>nyā, heikavā</i>	my male cross-cousin (man speaking)
<i>nyā, nātawidj</i>	my mother's brother	<i>nyā, ddjv tāj</i>	my older brother's son (man speaking)
<i>n, in, dūwā</i>		<i>n, andkóta</i>	my father

²However the more general word would be *n, atawidj*, my relative (*inydnyā djdjiddj* *inadbut*, he marries a relative; literally, relative, he knows it, to take a wife).

RELIGION

Religious matters occupy but a minor place in Havasupai life. Ceremonialism is meager and interest in the supernatural is neither extensive nor developed in systematic form. 771 [196]

The paragraphs which follow express religious notions as they are known to a layman. It is regrettable that it was not possible to obtain the viewpoint of the shaman. Of the two living at the time of my visits, one died during the second winter; the other is quite deaf. [124]

SOULS, SPIRITS AND SHAMANISM

Each human has a soul in his heart; the word, *yawaffs*, refers to both soul and heart. It leaves his body at death, but not when he dreams or lies unconscious (*K'edjimpik*, a little dead). More explicitly, when a man dreams that he is in a foreign land, he sees (or feels) his fleshly self as actor, not his soul. To be sure when he wakes he is lying where he fell asleep, he is fully aware that he has been dreaming, yet he offers no explanation why others saw his slumbering form when he thought himself in another place. 774

The soul of a dead man may appear as a ghost (*amtye'*); this is short and like a shadow. Shamans alone commonly see ghosts, or rather, their familiar spirits seek them out at night and report their doings, yet others may see them. When a ghost appears to a man it is a portent that a relative will soon die, or else it is to cause the man himself to sicken. Ghosts are said always to be malignant; a man who heard and saw one would sicken that very day and fall fast. People are afraid to go about alone at night, especially near the burial ground, which at any time is dangerous, for fear ghosts will frighten or seize them. Yet the following instances show mere sight or contact is not in itself harmful. 775 [187]

Snide saw one near her camp one night. He looked like an ordinary mortal; he was bare-headed. He passed on down the canyon. In the morning, the whole family examined the spot but found no footprints. [169]

Arthur saw a ghost in the brush at the head of the creek. He looked like a man, except that his head was much larger.

Pete also saw one. He met him near dawn in Lee Canyon. The ghost said that he wanted Pete to dismount and sit down to talk with him, so he did so. Pete nodded and fell into a doze. When it was nearly daylight, the ghost said, "It is light now; let us go," and he went ahead. When the ghost was twenty feet away, Pete thought he would keep up with him and talk, but the faster he whipped his horse, the more the ghost drew away from him. The ghost led him along a trail following a ledge that

*The word *hufjiddi* was also given for ghost in an association test.

THOUGHT

So much nonsense has been written about savage thought that it may not be amiss to record that I find the Havasupai clearly the equals of my white acquaintances in reasoning.¹ Granting them their premises and the limitations of their knowledge, their judgments are justified. 153

The inability of the savage to isolate abstract concepts has also been asserted. As a somewhat indirect test I asked how one thinks² (*wasdēgd*). Sinyella, who understood the interpreter's question with difficulty explained that he knew nothing about it: he had never been told Jews to whom the question could be put directly,³ said that his whole body was involved in thought, although his eyes, head, and to a lesser extent, his ears, were more intimately concerned. Two years later he stated:— 828

"I feel myself thinking. Perhaps part of my body thinks; I feel it move. Perhaps it is the tendons all over my body: no, they simply move. The blood in my veins goes into my brain and my heart: when it enters my brain I think what I am going to do. My thought goes on all over my body. It (both blood and thought) causes my whole body to move about. (Q.—You are thinking hard, trying to tell me; where do you feel it most?) In my head: it feels as though I were trying hard there." Sinyella added, "Most men say they think with their hearts: I say so too. Some say they think with their heads: they talk about who has the most brains." Jew's wife, who was listening, answered, "I think with my heart."

Like ourselves, Havasupai scratch their heads when in a quandary (*kəpdaʔdātəpəgd*, "It is hard to say.") 201

The conventional expression is then that the heart is concerned with thought, as it is also the seat of the soul, the life. Jew's answer is however a reasonably good attempt at introspective analysis.⁴

DREAMS

So much stress is laid on the connection of dreams with religious phenomena by some writers that it seems important to record dreams and the attitudes to them. Dreams (*tsəmdəʔgd*, *quttsəmdəʔgd*, cf. *smdgd*, sleep) were obtained from an old man, Sinyella, and a young one, Jew Checkapanyega. These are on their face actual dreams, not stereotyped like those of the Crow recorded by Lowie and the Ojibway visions of Radin. 114 115 124

A distinction is drawn between unimportant and significant dreams. 787 While there are no definite criteria to distinguish them, it seems that those

¹This is also the well-nigh unanimous judgment of my American colleagues respecting those Indians they know. Curiously enough, published statements of this fact are rare—is it too obvious?—leaving the field to the fulminations of the closet-philosopher.

²See also the remarks on shadows, p. 378.

³Jew has attended school.

⁴These statements modify those made earlier in this series, vol. XVI, 514, footnote.

Preface

This report was first submitted to the faculty of the University of Utah as a thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Anthropology. Subsequently, Dr. Lealie A. Spier kindly read and commented upon the thesis in some detail. Where the text has been altered at his suggestion, reference is made to a personal communication from him dated December 3, 1957. It should be added, however, that I assume responsibility for the present conclusions. I thank Dr. Spier for the careful attention with which he evaluated my report.

Field research was accomplished on four trips, totaling five months spent among the Havasupai. On the first trip (July-August, 1950), major emphasis was upon the collection of census and genealogical data. During the second trip (July-August, 1951), attention was focused upon the life cycle of the woman, population problems, and shamanism. The third trip, lasting only three weeks (November-December, 1951), afforded an opportunity to observe daily routine and other activities at a different season of the year. Interviewing of two medicine men occupied most evenings. A final trip of three weeks' duration (September, 1952) provided contact with a segment of the Havasupai population living at Grand Canyon Indian Village on the south rim of the Grand Canyon proper. (Residents of Grand Canyon Indian Village are employed by the National Park Service and by private business establishments in the National Park area.) During this last trip, interviews with both men and women were focused almost exclusively upon the life cycle of the Havasupai woman.

In the summer of 1952, I returned to the Havasupai Indian Reservation for three months to make a study of the primitive tribal religion under a research grant from the University of Utah Research Fund. This opportunity was taken to check certain details, included in the original thesis on the Havasupai woman, with additional informants. The thesis was read and evaluated, in whole or in part, by several tribal members, including original informants. Accordingly, modifications have been made in the present publication.

Although the total number of informants consulted was larger, the data presented here were obtained primarily from nine individuals, three men and six women, ranging in age from 31 to 86 years. I was at all times dependent upon the good graces, interest, and convenience of informants and interpreters, all of whom were unpaid. Occasional small gifts were made to a few individuals who worked most earnestly, but these gifts were never promised nor given as an advance inducement.

The definitive monograph on the Havasupai is Leslie Spier's Havasupai Ethnography, published in 1928. This, together with several shorter